

From: [Mark Allen](#)
To: [Warren Zehner](#)
Subject: Fw: Brief for Jeannine
Date: 09/14/2011 01:45 PM

Here's what I sent Susan as my brief for my boss. Told Susan, and you too, to feel free to edit/improve. Thanks again...Mark

----- Forwarded by Mark Allen/R6/USEPA/US on 09/14/2011 01:44 PM -----

From: Mark Allen/R6/USEPA/US
To: Susan Webster/R6/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Mark Allen/R6/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 09/14/2011 01:42 PM
Subject: Brief for Jeannine

Susan:

Feel free to edit/improve. Thanks for the meeting. Always get good comments on Warren...

*The way the situation was described as an "radiation emergency" that required special radiation monitors.

*EPA Superfund was told by State of New Mexico they had a specialized MOU/MOA with all 19 Pueblos that had all things in place ie, points of contact, access agreement etc. Was told the state was "adamant" about this.

*Two types of radiation monitoring occurred - Fly over, like at Laguna and stationary monitoring.

*San I had stationary monitors

*Since it was an emergency situation and the State (NM) was adamant about the MOU/MOA they had in place, EPA followed the State's procedures, and assumed data information sharing was part of the agreements

*EPA did not publish any data. It was handed over to the state.

*It was explained to me that specialized KSA's are needed to interpret radiation data. If one does not know what they are reading/interpreting, the wrong message could be sent out. EXAMPLE Potassium 40 is naturally released when trees are burnt> While radio active it is not harmful due to tree burning.

*I called Neil (Weber) at San I and left a message with him. Was going to ask if he had seen the MOU/MOA mentioned during my meeting with Superfund.

Side Note: EPA's MOA/MOU with Laguna does address data sharing.



9470074